

Now viewing document 4 (19478) of 134 in Search: |BP witness...

CUNNINGHAM

Company	BPXP
Box No	MDL2179VOL000001
Custodian	Internal Investigation Team - Source Docs
Beg Doc No	BP-HZN-BLY00061251
End Doc No	BP-HZN-BLY00061251
DocID	BP-HZN-BLY00061251
Page Count	1
ParentID	
Attachment	
Family	BP-HZN-BLY00061251-BP-HZN-BLY00061251
Properties	Standalone
From	Fontenot
To	
CC	
BCC	
Subject	
Doc Date	
TimeSent	
Date Created	05/09/2010
Date Last Modified	07/26/2010
Date Received	08/25/2010
File Size	32256
Attachment Title	Cunningham, Erick.xls
Application	Microsoft Excel
File Path	\\2010-0544\Marshall Maestri\InternalInvestigationSharePoint\Interviews and Witness Statements\BP\Cunningham, Erick\Cunningham, Erick.xls
Doc Link	BP-HZN-BLY00061251.xls
Page Count TOF	
Folder ID	
Full Text	<p>Erick Cunningham 5/9/2010 @ 11:30 - 1:00 Westlake Interviewers: Kevin Fontenot, Kent Corser, Warren Winters Started with BP 10/12/2009 role: technical role, support PSCM, support supplier management, create training programs, working segment recommended practice GP-? Reports to Martin Varco (not in STS) Current main focus is new rig coming - Ascension & Clarion Attend 2 meetings in regards to cementing Horizon - March 23rd 2pm & April 14th @ 8:30am March 23rd meeting Attendees: Brian Morel, Mark Hafle, Jesse Gagliano Topic of Mtg: Long String, weren't sure if they were going to get 7" or 7 5/8" Big question was where they could get TOC circulating Came into the meeting and Jesse had OptiCem running Challenged the foam application usage and the complexity of the job During this meeting the un-foamed cement was feasible and a better option in his option No decision point in the meeting, it was all discussion</p>

EXHIBIT #	16
WIT:	

Discussion between Jesse and Brian about getting the well conditions correct
 After the meeting the team learned more details around the well fracture issues
 April 14th 8:30 Meeting
 Attendees: Erick Cunningham, Mark Hafle, Brian Morel, Jesse Gagliano, Greg Walz, +1 unknown name
 Topic of Meeting: Request to review ECD modeling
 Decision had been made to use foam and a 9 7/8" X 7" long string
 Question was could they circulate foam in place
 targeted TOC thought it was 1000' as per GDP-1060
 Concerns about Frac gradients and Pore Pressure and what was the most representative scenario
 Jesse was running OptiCem and they were making inputs to the model
 Erick was not previously informed of the foamed slurry design
 OptiCem indicated they could place cement successfully
 Meeting ended and decision was to develop a documents for presentation to decision makers
 Also development of decision tree
 Erick commented he had never seen decision tree until yesterday(5/9/2010)
 Conceptionally overall the job looked reasonable no big red flags
 They brought me in to look at the ECD model not how to cement it
 Looking at only one decision point "can we circulate cement"
 Did not see Halliburton design documents until post incident
 Received some documents (lab results, DIMS report, post job report but did not get design report) from Jesse on April 26th in preparation for the MMS meeting
 Ask Jesse for the final design report he received on 5/3/2010
 Not sure if he has design report from the 15th
 Two power point presentations one April 13 (liner option) and one April 14 (long string option)
 Commented that it was a good decision to make the wiper trip because the team would learn a lot on the final wiper trip
 Was not asked to review the MOC for the cement/long string
 Never been in an MOC with BP
 Did not give GOM any formal response back from meetings nor was he ask for a written response
 Never talked about centralization placement
 After the job asked Jesse "did you see anything wrong with the job" answer "no, except not running the additional centralizers"
 Reviewed April 18th report and advised interview team on his option of results and terminology.

Hash

8596e913fa1cfba31001c9a2a36ee2f2

Edit Tracking

Sticky Notes

Search Terms

Redacted

HCFolder

Erick Cunningham
5/9/2010 @ 11:30 - 1:00
Westlake

Interviewers: Kevin Fontenot, Kent Corser, Warren Winters

Started with BP 10/12/2009

role: technical role, support PSCM, support supplier management, create training programs, working segment recommended practice GP-?

Reports to Martin Varco (not in STS)

Current main focus is new rig coming - Ascension & Clarion

Attend 2 meetings in regards to cementing Horizon - March 23rd 2pm & April 14th @ 8:30am

March 23rd meeting

Attendees: Brian Morel, Mark Hafle, Jesse Gagliano

Topic of Mtg: Long String, weren't sure if they were going to get 7" or 7 5/8"

Big question was where they could get TOC circulating

Came into the meeting and Jesse had OptiCem running

Challenged the foam application usage and the complexity of the job

During this meeting the un-foamed cement was feasible and a better option in his opinion

No decision point in the meeting, it was all discussion

Discussion between Jesse and Brian about getting the well conditions correct

After the meeting the team learned more details around the well fracture issues

April 14th 8:30 Meeting

Attendees: Erick Cunningham, Mark Hafle, Brian Morel, Jesse Gagliano, Greg Walz, +1 unknown name

Topic of Meeting: Request to review ECD modeling

Decision had been made to use foam and a 9 7/8" X 7" long string

Question was could they circulate foam in place

targeted TOC thought it was 1000' as per GDP-1060

Concerns about Frac gradients and Pore Pressure and what was the most representative scenario

Jesse was running OptiCem and they were making inputs to the model

Erick was not previously informed of the foamed slurry design

OptiCem indicated they could place cement successfully

Meeting ended and decision was to develop a documents for presentation to decision makers

Also development of decision tree

Erick commented he had never seen decision tree until yesterday(5/9/2010)

Conceptually overall the job looked reasonable no big red flags

They brought me in to look at the ECD model not how to cement it

Looking at only one decision point "can we circulate cement"

Did not see Halliburton design documents until post incident

Received some documents (lab results, DIMS report, post job report but did not get design report) from Jesse on April 26th in preparation for the MMS meeting

Ask Jesse for the final design report he received on 5/3/2010

Not sure if he has design report from the 15th

Two power point presentations one April 13 (liner option) and one April 14 (long string option)

Commented that it was a good decision to make the wiper trip because the team would learn a lot on the final wiper trip

Was not asked to review the MOC for the cement/long string

Never been in an MOC with BP

Did not give GOM any formal response back from meetings nor was he ask for a written response

Never talked about centralization placement

After the job asked Jesse "did you see anything wrong with the job" answer "no, except not running the additional centralizers"

Reviewed April 18th report and advised interview team on his option of results and terminology.

